



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,219	12/21/2001	Marc Vidal	10974-239005/MGH-0792.4	1413
26161	7590	03/09/2004	V	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC 225 FRANKLIN ST BOSTON, MA 02110			EXAMINER LAMBERTSON, DAVID A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1636	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

14.8

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/027,219

Applicant(s)

VIDAL ET AL.

Examiner

David A. Lambertson

Art Unit

1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 108-148 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 108-148 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claim 1, drawn to a method of detecting a protein-protein interaction by mating cells, wherein each cell to be mated contains a different fusion test protein, classified in class 435, subclass 29.
- II. Claims 108-130 and 141, drawn to a method for detecting protein-protein interactions in a cell where the cell contains both fusion test proteins, classified in class 435, subclass 7.2.
- III. Claims 131-139, drawn to cells comprising two fusion test proteins, classified in class 435, subclass 243.
- IV. Claim 140, drawn to a DNA construct encoding a hybrid protein comprising a DNA binding domain and C-terminal tag, classified in class 536, subclass 23.4.
- V. Claims 142-144, drawn to a method for detecting the disruption of a protein-protein interaction by a test compound, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
- VI. Claims 145-146, drawn to method for detecting the interaction between an RNA molecule and a protein, classified in class 435, subclass 4.
- VII. Claims 147-148, drawn to method for detecting the interaction between two RNA molecules, classified in class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions Group I and Group II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of

Art Unit: 1636

operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation and are not disclosed as capable of being used together. Specifically, in Group I, the test fusion proteins are brought into contact through a mating step, because the test fusions are located in different cells. In contrast, Group II requires that both test fusion be present in a single cell at the start of the assay, and has no requirement for a mating step. Because these inventions involve different steps in the methods as claimed, the inventions have different modes of operation and represent patentably distinct inventions.

Inventions Group I and Group III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions functions and are not disclosed as capable of being used together. Specifically, the claimed cells of Group III contain two fusion genes within the cells, whereas the method of Group I involves the mating of cells each having an individual fusion gene; therefore, the cells are functionally distinct between the two inventions. As a result of this functional distinction between the claimed cells of Group III and the method of Group I, the inventions represent patentably distinct subject matter.

Inventions Group I and Group IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed (the construct of Group

Art Unit: 1636

IV) can be used in a materially different process, such as the recombinant purification of a desired protein using the C-terminal tag.

Inventions Group I and Groups V-VII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different effects and are not disclosed as capable of being used together. Specifically, the outcome of Group I is directed toward the detection of an interaction between two proteins, whereas the outcome of Groups V-VII are directed to the identification of a compound that disrupts an interaction between two proteins, the detection of an RNA-protein interaction, and the detection of an RNA-RNA interaction, respectively. Each of these outcomes is distinct from each other, therefore the methods as claimed have different effects, and are considered to be patentably distinct.

Inventions Group II and Group III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product (the cells of Group III) can be used in a materially different process, such as the recombinant production of fusion proteins.

Inventions Group II and Group IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the

Art Unit: 1636

instant case the different inventions have different functions and are not disclosed as capable of being used together. Specifically, the method of Group II requires the presence of two test fusion proteins for the detection of an interaction, whereas the construct as claimed in Group IV does not provide for the presence of two fusion proteins, and can be used for a materially distinct process (such as the production of a recombinant fusion protein for purification). As a result of this distinction, the inventions have different functional properties, and are therefore considered to be patentably distinct inventions.

Inventions II, V, VI and VII are each unrelated to the other. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different effects and are not disclosed as capable of being used together. Specifically, each of the methods is directed to a different outcome (i.e., the detection of a protein-protein interaction (II), the identification of a compound that disrupts a protein-protein interaction (V), the detection of an RNA-protein interaction (VI), and the detection of an RNA-RNA interaction (VII)), and therefore each has a different effect. Because each invention is directed to a different outcome, the inventions are considered to be patentably distinct.

Inventions Group III and Group IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions and are not disclosed as capable of

Art Unit: 1636

being used together. Specifically, the cells of Group III require the presence of two test fusion proteins, whereas the construct as claimed in Group IV does not provide for the presence of two fusion proteins. As a result of this distinction, the inventions have different functional properties, and are therefore considered to be patentably distinct inventions.

Inventions Group III and Groups V-VII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product (the cells of Group III) can be used in a materially different process from the methods claimed in Groups V-VII, such as the recombinant production of a protein, or in any one of the methods of Groups V-VII.

Inventions Group IV and V-VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions and are not disclosed as capable of being used together. Specifically, the methods of Groups V-VII require the presence of either two test fusion proteins (Group V) or the presence of either one or two RNA-protein fusions (Groups VI and VII), whereas the construct as claimed in Group IV does not provide for the presence of two fusion proteins or RNA-protein fusions, and can be used for a materially distinct process such as the production of a recombinant fusion protein for purification). As a result of

Art Unit: 1636

this distinction, the inventions have different functional properties, and are therefore considered to be patentably distinct inventions.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Furthermore, especially in instances where the classifications are the same, the non-patent literature searches required for each of these inventions are not co-extensive, hence said searches would be burdensome. Therefore restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102,

Art Unit: 1636

103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).


Art Unit: 1636

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David A. Lambertson whose telephone number is (571) 272-0771. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am to 4pm, Mon.-Fri., first Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Remy Yucel, Ph.D. can be reached on (571) 272-0781. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David A. Lambertson, Ph.D.
AU 1636



JAMES KETTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER